DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 366 891 CG 025 239

AUTHOR James, William H.; And Others
TITLE Program Evaluation of Growin' to Win: A Latchkey and Summer Program for At-Risk Youth.
INSTITUTION Washington Univ., Seattle. Center for the Study and Teaching of At-Risk Students.
SPONS AGENCY Office of Elementary and Secondary Education, Washington, DC. School Improvement Programs.
PUB DATE Jan 94
CONTRACT S233A10082-91A
NOTE 36p.; For a related document, see CG 025 240.
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *At Risk Persons; Elementary Education; *Elementary School Students; Juvenile Gangs; *Latchkey Children; Middle Schools; Program Effectiveness; *School Community Programs; Self Esteem; Substance Abuse; *Summer Programs
IDENTIFIERS *Growin to Win

ABSTRACT

This document presents an evaluation of the effectiveness of the Growin' to Win Project, an after-school and summer program targeted at elementary and middle school aged youth at high risk of substance abuse and gang involvement. Growin' to Win is an expansion of a model latchkey program piloted at two Tacoma (Washington) schools in 1990. The program provides after-school and summer activities which encourage resistance to substance use; the improvement of self-esteem; and the development of academic, social, and life skills for students; and includes counseling and case management services as well as training for students, teachers, and staff in the areas of substance abuse prevention and intervention. Schools applied for participation in the program and were selected based on criteria that included student risk factors, and the expanded program has been implemented at three middle schools and one elementary school. The evaluation reports that, across three of the four sites, positive impact on the students' self-esteem was the most recognizable effect of the program. Findings suggest that self-esteem is a very important developmental factor for latchkey children and youth as it represents an evolving, cognitive-emotional attribute that is related to self-concept, school and peer relations, emotional well-being, physical self-perception, and resistance to substance use. Findings are presented for each of the four participating schools. Relevant forms are appended. (Author/NB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 366 891

PROGRAM EVALUATION OF GROWIN' TO WIN: A LATCHKEY AND SUMMER PROGRAM FOR AT-RISK YOUTH

Award Number: S233A10082-91A
Drug-Free Schools and Communities Grant Project

Project Director: Karyn Clarke
Project Facilitator: Molly McCulley

Tacoma School District No. 10
601 South 8th
Tacoma, Washington 98401

Dr. Rudy Crew, Superintendent
(206) 596-1000

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
W. JAMES
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Evaluation Conducted by:

William H. James, Ph.D.
Research Assistant Professor
University of Washington College of Education
Center for the Study and Teaching of At-Risk Students (C-STARS)
Seattle, Washington 98195
(206) 543-3815

CG025239

January 1994

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table of Contents

A School-Community Partnership Program....1

The Partner Schools....3

Abstract....4

Introduction....5

Review of Literature....6

Independent Program Evaluation of Accomplishments in Relation to Goals and Objectives....9

Observation Summaries....10

Summary of Findings....14

Recommendations....24

References....25

Appendix A: Intake Form

Appendix B: Pre-Test/Post-Test Form

Appendix C: Evaluation Form (C-STARS)

A School-Community Partnership Program

District: Tacoma School District No. 10
601 South 8th
Tacoma, Washington
(206) 596-1000
Dr. Rudy Crew, Superintendent

Schools: Hunt Middle School
Jason Lee Middle School
McIlvaigh Middle School
Whitman Elementary School

SUMMARY: The Tacoma School District has received state and federal funds for its efforts under the guidelines adopted through the 1986 Drug-Free Schools and Communities Act. The district is a rapidly growing urban district of 34,000 students and families. According to the 1990 census, Pierce County is the second most populous county in Washington State. Tacoma is a low-income, high-density urban community. According to national data from the FBI's Uniform Crime Data reporting system (1992), Tacoma is one of the three most violence-plagued communities in the Western United States--grouped with Los Angeles and Oakland, California. The violence is substance abuse-related, with entrenched gang activity.

The Tacoma schools enroll 31,685 children and youth and 50% of the households have a family income below $25,000. The cultural demographics are 64 percent White, and 36 percent ethnic populations that include Black, Hispanic, Asian/Pacific Islander, and American Indian/Alaskan Native.

Community Agency: Metropolitan Development Council
622 Tacoma Ave. S. Suite 6
Tacoma, Washington 98402
(206) 383-3921
J. Lindsey Hinand, J.D., Executive Director
J. Douglas Swanberg, Division Director

SUMMARY: The Metropolitan Development Council is a community-based agency located in Tacoma. The council provides overall management and supervision of support and outreach services for homeless and at-risk youth, counseling and case management services for the elderly, energy and emergency assistance, and educational opportunity and resource services. Family and children services are provided as well as food projects, chemical dependency treatment programs, and home weatherization services. This agency partnership has evolved into a Readiness to Learn Consortium of 24 partner programs assisting with latchkey, social, and health services.

Project Evaluator:

University of Washington
Center for the Study and Teaching of At-Risk Students (C-STARS)
4725 30th Ave. NE
Seattle, Washington 98195
(206) 543-3815
Dr. William H. James, Research Assistant Professor

SUMMARY: The University of Washington's Center for the Study and Teaching of At-Risk Students (C-STARS) is located in the College of Education and provides training, technical assistance, and program evaluation services to school districts and community-based organizations providing services to at-risk students. The Center has a special unit that focuses on research and evaluation of programs designed to reduce student use of alcohol and other drugs. The Center has provided the program evaluations for the following federal DFSC grants: Activities, School Personnel Training(2), Counselor Training, Demonstration, and this Emergency Grant.

THE PARTNER SCHOOLS	PRINCIPAL	MDC STAFF
Hunt Middle School 6501 South 10th Tacoma, WA. (206) 596-2335	Cherry Goudeau	Jane Ghilarducci
Jason Lee Middle School 602 Sprague Tacoma, WA. (206) 596-1395	Charlotte Carr	William Barrett
McIlvaigh Middle School 1801 E. 56th Tacoma, WA. (206) 596-2080	Jay Stricherz	Byron Pernell
Whitman Elementary School 1120 South 39th Tacoma, WA. (206) 596-2077	John Blix	Rajini Poth

Abstract

The Growin' to Win Project is an after-school and summer program targeted at elementary and middle school aged youth at high risk of substance abuse and gang involvement. The project is a collaborative effort of the Tacoma School District and the Metropolitan Development Council, a 501(c)(3) non-profit community-based organization. The Growin' to Win project is an expansion of a model latchkey program piloted at two Tacoma schools in 1990. The program provides after school and summer activities which encourage resistance to substance use, improving self-esteem, and the development of academic, social, and life skills. Also included are counseling and case management services. The program provides training for students, teachers and staff in the areas of substance abuse prevention and intervention.

The expanded project has been implemented at Hunt Middle School, Jason Lee Middle School, McIlvaigh Middle School, and Whitman Elementary School. Schools applied for participation in the program and were selected based on criteria that included student risk factors. *Across three of the four sites, positive impact on the students' self-esteem was the most recognizable effect of the program.* The findings indicate that self-esteem is a very important developmental factor for latchkey children and youth as it represents an evolving, cognitive-emotional attribute that is related to self-concept, school and peer relations, emotional well-being, physical self-perception, and resistance to substance use.

Introduction

The Growin' to Win Latchkey and Summer Program for At-Risk Youth was funded for a 24-month period (from September 1991 through August 31, 1993) by the United States Department of Education. Project objectives were designed as specific activities in four schools (3 middle schools and 1 elementary school) in the Tacoma School District. The intent of the program was to provide after-school and summer activities that included counseling, case management services, and training for students, teachers, and staff in the areas of substance abuse prevention and intervention. Schools applied for participation in the program and were selected based on criteria that included six specific risk factors correlated to future substance abuse, violence, and school failure.

Review of the Literature

The literature on latchkey programs is very limited. A study by Bill (1989) was designed to determine the relationship between selected principal, school, and school district demographics and policies on latchkey children. In addition, this study investigated principals' priorities toward latchkey children, identification of latchkey children, and programs for latchkey children within public schools. The target schools for this investigation were those serving any combination of grades kindergarten through eighth grade in the State of Illinois. The study utilized standardized survey methodology. A stratified random sample of 350 principals was used. The data were presented in tabular form and chi square was used to test for statistical significance. The findings of the study indicated that few policies are being developed by school districts on latchkey children. Secondly, few principals identify latchkey students in their buildings for the purposes of providing programs or services. Thirdly, principals tend to feel that there is a need to develop policies and procedures to identify latchkey students, but that the operation of latchkey programs should be left to communities and not be a function of the school. Finally, although the most common program for latchkey students is an after-school program, few school districts have developed any type of program.

One of the most glaring omissions in studies of latchkey children is the determination of the vulnerability of children to child abuse and neglect when left in unsupervised settings. Kraizer, et al (1990) conducted a needs assessment and pilot study of risk factors for children in kindergarten through third grade. This study reported that while it is widely known that many families leave their children unsupervised, it is not known precisely how many children are left in self-care, how or why the choice is made, or what are the effects of self-care on the development and safety of the children. This study and others (Coleman, et al, 1989; Diamond et al, 1989) highlight the need to carefully study the existing patterns of self-care, programming needs that will address behavioral and academic achievement. In summary, this population has largely been ignored in the social and health research. Research usually follows policy and as mentioned in the survey of principals study, policy focus on these students is absent from most schools.

Some information on latchkey students is provided in a study completed of school-aged children in Boston, Massachusetts (Seligson et al, 1990). A survey questionnaire was completed by 1,447 parents of school-aged children in Boston. The results revealed that three out of four parents who were employed were unable to be home every day when their children returned from school, and that many children spent some time every day in the care of siblings. Inflexible workplace policies and schedules often create child care difficulties for parents. Many low-income parents who pay for child care use anywhere from 10 to 20 percent of their income for school-aged children. These factors indicate that employers must become more involved in providing services that will assist parents in child care concerns and after-school latchkey programs for their children.

An investigation of the effectiveness of an after-school program for primary grade latchkey student on precursors of substance abuse was conducted by Ross, Saavedra, Shur, Winters, and Feiner (1992). This study evaluated whether an alcohol and other drug use prevention program operating after school in 24 low-income primary schools could reduce certain precursors (such as self-esteem, low academic achievement, school behavioral problems) of alcohol and other drug use thought to place latchkey children at risk. The intervention strategies had children participate daily for 144 days in 2-hour sessions consisting of supervised homework, self-esteem guiding exercises, free play, and creative dramatics during a seven-week period. The evaluation by these researchers indicated that the overall program was effective in achieving its most immediate intended outcome, the improvement of academic performance. Hypothetically, it can be speculated that this kind of gain will reduce the likelihood of school failure and improve self-esteem for at-risk children.

The Tacoma Schools Latchkey Initiative

Tacoma Schools initiated a policy-shaping latchkey pilot program in 1990. Subsequent initial success led to a formal two-year expanded study from 1991 through 1993. The program, developed by school site and central district administrators, marks Tacoma schools' entrance into an area which is largely a programmatic void in other communities.

Tacoma schools identified their latchkey students' and families' needs for the United States Department of Education (USDOE). USDOE validated the district's

localized adoption of effective latchkey strategies (e.g., Ross et al, 1992) by awarding a two-year discretionary grant for a four-site program. Tacoma schools initiated a latch-key program on behalf of the district families--many of which are similar to those mentioned in the Boston demographics study--who could not develop latchkey with their own resources.

Independent Program Evaluation of Accomplishments in Relation to Goals and Objectives

This program evaluation was completed through an independent audit of the data assembled by program staff. The evaluation was based on the period of project operation over the 24 month period from September 1991 through August 1993. Briefly summarized below by objectives are the accomplishments made since the project began. The objectives were to be achieved over 24 months (2-year funding period). The evaluation data compiled was descriptive in nature; though pre- and post-testing provided trend indicators. Changes to baseline scores can be viewed as multiple N=1 studies.

Objective 1: Provide 1200 students, 150 staff, and program staff with a comprehensive training/educational assistance program which is based upon individual school-based needs.

This project objective was substantially exceeded. Double the projected number of students were served. The number of staff trained was 178, exceeding the projection by nearly twenty percent.

Exactly 2,442 students (491 at McIlvaigh, 382 at Whitman, 859 at Hunt, and 710 at Jason Lee) were provided comprehensive training and educational assistance through student assemblies: "Coming 2" a youth drama group with an anti-drug message; "Kid's Day," a program of self-empowerment for children and youth; and other presentations focusing on gang and youth violence. Eighty students participated in a prevention activity in personal empowerment via the martial arts (Tai Kwon Do). During the summer programs at Jason Lee and Whitman schools, 180 students were provided prevention training through self-esteem building and anger management curricula.

Staff (75 at McIlvaigh, 42 at Whitman, 71 at Hunt, and 79 at Jason Lee--276 in all) were provided comprehensive training and educational assistance through staff inservice and follow-up peer coaching that focused on: motivating and managing at-risk students, win-win mediation skills with at-risk students, relating to at-risk students, motivating adolescents to recovery, and gang and youth violence prevention education.

***Objective 2:* Replicate a successful after school and summer program model at four Tacoma schools with high levels of at-risk youth.**

This objective was addressed and accomplished. The project evaluator made multiple site visits to the four schools and observed and documented attainment of this objective through participant/observer activities, detailed field notes, collection of documents, semi-structured interviews (see Appendix A) and informal interviews. The project evaluator observed that the after-school latchkey programs were in place for at-risk youth at the targeted schools. The following "snapshots" are sample observations compiled from a number of visits to each site.

Observation Summaries

Hunt Middle School

Hunt Middle School is located in the northwest area of Tacoma and provides education for 6th, 7th, and 8th grade students. Hunt has special education classes and classes for highly capable learners. In addition, the school has a Learning Center for moderately disabled students and an Exceptional Wing for severely disabled students.

The latchkey program was located in a classroom with pictures and posters on the walls and a radio playing popular music. The first hour of the program was devoted to assisting students with their homework and the second hour included a snack and self-discipline activities (such as a Tai Kwon Do self-defense class), and recreational activities such as basketball and soccer.

Jason Lee Middle School

Jason Lee Middle School is located in the northcentral area of Tacoma and provides education for students in 6th, 7th, and 8th grade. Jason Lee is a magnet school for arts and technology and has special programs including drum and dance, drama, band, computer lab, television studio, and classes for highly capable and special needs students.

The latchkey program was located in a classroom and the first hour of the program was for homework while the second hour included a snack and group activity. The

evaluator observed about 20 students doing homework and being tutored by one of three staff present.

McIlvaigh Middle School

McIlvaigh Middle School is located in the southeast area of Tacoma and provides classes for students in grades 6 through 8 and has programs for highly capable and special needs students. McIlvaigh has a Therapeutic Learning Center and special programs for students who have special physical and emotional needs.

The program was located in a classroom and the first hour of the program was spent on tutoring, the second hour for a snack and recreational activities, and the last hour for group work. During site visits, the evaluator observed the latchkey program tutorial program where students were working on homework and being tutored in specific subjects. The staff to student ratio was typically 1 to 5 students working in small groups.

Whitman Elementary School

Whitman Elementary School is located in the central area of Tacoma and provides classes for students in grades K-5. Whitman has a TALC (teaching active learning and communications) program, a learning resources center for special needs children, and uses the Accelerated Schools curriculum.

The latchkey program was located in the gymnasium. The first hour of the program was for tutoring and the second hour for snack and social skills, while the third hour was spent in recreational activities. During multiple site visits, the evaluator observed about 20 students working on homework and the students were very engaged in the activities. There were generally about five staff members present. Group work was done according to grade level and there were monthly topics selected such as "self-esteem" and "making friends."

Note: Hypothetically, due to developmental age, latchkey programming seemed most comprehensive in the elementary school setting.

Objective 3: ***Recruit and train a minimum of four volunteers for each school site (16 total volunteers) and generate a minimum of 640 hours (40 hours per volunteer) of volunteer support for direct services.***

The Metropolitan Development Council documented student, intern, and organizational volunteers that generated a total of 1,498 hours of services to the program. The objective was exceeded by seventeen percent. This objective was met through the cooperation of individual volunteers and organizational volunteers that included Tacoma Community College, Big Brothers and Big Sisters, Boy Scouts, the Tacoma Police Department, and the Pierce County Health Department.

Objective 4: ***Provide comprehensive intervention and case management services during the school year and summer to 160 youth (40 from each participating school over two years, or 20 students per year) considered by school personnel to be at-risk for substance abuse, and their families. At-risk factors include chronic tardiness, lack of school attendance, lack of school achievement or school failure, and behavioral problems.***

Youth Intervention Specialists participant records at each of the four sites indicated that there were approximately 40 students each over two years. During each school year, there were approximately 20 students enrolled at each site. During the summer, an average of 180 students participated at the two sites. See Tables 1-4 for school-related factors and the pre-test/post-test instrument for the measurable school indicators.

Objective 5: ***Develop a manual for implementing the project including written details on program model, screening and training of volunteers, staff responsibilities at each site, family intervention protocol, and a replication plan that can be used by other schools and agencies.***

The manual is in the first draft stage and the final product will be available within six months after the funding period of the federal grant (February, 1994). It will be disseminated to all elementary and middle schools in the Tacoma School District and other interested districts in the region. An initial program overview was presented by the Project Director and Project Evaluator to the 7th Annual Drug-Free Schools and Communities Conference (December 1,1993; Washington, D.C.).

Summary of Findings 1991-1993

Whitman Elementary School

Demographic Data

Based on the available data, the average enrollment at Whitman Elementary School was 20 students. The students ranged in age from six to twelve years old with the average age at eight years and 11 months. The student population typically included 14 males and six females. On average, 30% of the students were in 2nd grade, 20% in 3rd grade, 15% in 1st grade, 15% in 4th grade, 15% in 5th grade, and 5% in kindergarten. On average, 45% were living with a single parent, 20% with both parents, 20% living in joint custody, and 15% living with a guardian. An average of 50% of the students were European American, 40% African American, 5% Native American and 5% Hispanic/Latino. Generally, 90% of the students were eligible for free or reduced lunch, 10% were in special education, 20% in Chapter 1 (special academic support), and 10% were in speech therapy.

Source and Reason for Referral

About 90% of the students were referred by school staff, with 10% from other referral sources such as community agencies, parents, and self. An estimated 65% of the students were referred because of problems at home, 10% for behavior problems, and 25% referred had multiple reasons that included home, peer and behavioral problems.

***Note**: In the table below, a high score indicates the socially undesirable direction, a low score is socially desirable. Significantly, all of the categories indicated socially desirable changes for the students participating in the latchkey program at the elementary school site.*

TABLE 1: WHITMAN ELEMENTARY SCHOOL PRE AND POST-TEST AVERAGE SCORES (N=20)

Diagnostic Category	Pre	Post	Change
Family	2.90	2.85	-.05
School	3.55	2.25	-1.30
Self-esteem	5.05	3.20	-1.85
Substance Use	1.05	0.55	-.50
Personal Abuse	0.35	0.15	-.20
Safe Community	1.70	1.45	-.25

Hunt Middle School

Demographic Data

Based on the available data, the enrollment at Hunt Middle School averaged 22 students. Generally, the students ranged in age from 11 to 13 with the average age at 11 years, 9 months. The typical student population included 16 males and 6 females. On average, 68% of the students were in 6th grade and 32% of the students were in 7th grade. Typically, 45% lived with both parents, 45% lived with a single parent, and 10% with a guardian. Most often, about 64% of the students were European Americans, 32% African Americans, and 4% Native American. Approximately 55% of the students were eligible for free or reduced lunch and 36% were in special education.

Source and Reason for Referral

Generally, 64% of the students were referred by school staff and 36% referred by several sources including self, peer, parent and staff. Nearly all of the students were referred for academic reasons. Typically, 27% of the students had attendance problems, and 68% of all students referred had multiple reasons specified for the referral, which included such issues as problems at home, conflicts with peers, behavioral problems, social adjustment difficulties, self-esteem problems, and gang involvement.

***Note*: In the table below, a high score indicates the socially undesirable direction, a low score is socially desirable. Socially desirable changes occurred in the areas of self-esteem and personal abuse for the students involved in the latchkey program at this site.**

TABLE 2: HUNT MIDDLE SCHOOL PRE AND POST-TEST AVERAGE SCORES (N=22)

Diagnostic Category	Pre	Post	Change
Family	2.54	3.09	0.55
School	2.38	3.55	1.17
Self-esteem	4.32	3.86	-.46
Substance Use	0.57	0.77	0.20
Personal Abuse	0.27	0.22	-.05
Safe Community	0.58	0.59	.01

Jason Lee Middle School

Demographic Data

Based on the available data, the average enrollment at Jason Lee Middle School was 21 students. There were eight students with available pre and post-test data. Generally, the students ranged in age from 11 to 13 years with the average age at 12 years old. The typical student population included ten males and eleven females. Most of the students were in sixth grade. On average, two-thirds of the students lived with a single parent, with the remainder living with both parents. Generally, the students were African American, and the majority were in special education.

Source and Reason for Referral

Nearly all of the students were referred by school staff. About 90 percent of the students were referred for academic reasons, and for school behavior and peer problems.

***Note**: In the table below, a high score indicates the socially undesirable direction, a low score is socially desirable. Socially desirable change occurred in the area of self-esteem, and in community safety for the students enrolled in the latchkey program at this site.*

TABLE 3: JASON LEE MIDDLE SCHOOL PRE AND POST-TEST AVERAGE SCORES (N=8)

Diagnostic Category	Pre	Post	Change
Family	2.50	2.62	.12
School	6.00	5.62	-.38
Self-esteem	4.87	3.00	-1.87
Substance Use	0.12	0.37	0.25
Personal Abuse	0.25	0.37	0.12
Safe Community	0.75	6.62	-.13

McIlvaigh Middle School

Demographic Data

Based on the available data, the average enrollment at McIlvaigh Middle School was 20 students. The students ranged in age from 11 to 13 with the average age at 12 years old. Student population was typically evenly divided between females and males. On average, 41% of the students were in 6th grade and 59% in 7th grade. Typically, about 40% lived with both parents, 18% with single parent, 18% with a guardian, and 24% of the data indicated unspecified living situations. Typically, 76% of the students were African American, 12% mixed, and 12% other. On average, about 76% of the students were eligible for free or reduced lunch and none were identified as special education students.

Source and Reason for Referral

On average, about 10% of the students were referred by school staff, 20% referred by self, 5% by parents, and the rest from unspecified sources. Typically, 24% of the students were referred for academic reasons, 12% referred for behavioral problems, 17% referred for home problems, 6% for other reasons, and 41% for unspecified reasons.

***Note**: In the table below, a high score indicates the socially undesirable direction, a low score is socially desirable. As can be extrapolated at the other sites, a net change of .00 is viewed as a positive outcome since it indicates stabilization in a high-risk population. In other words, trends towards substance abuse and school failure were arrested.*

TABLE 4: MCILVAIGH MIDDLE SCHOOL PRE AND POST-TEST AVERAGE SCORES (N=17)

Diagnostic Category	Pre	Post	Change
Family	2.65	2.76	0.12
School	3.53	3.53	0.00
Self-esteem	2.41	3.06	0.65
Substance Use	0.35	0.56	0.21
Personal Abuse	0.06	0.06	0.00
Safe Community	1.06	1.13	0.07

Discussion

The 1990 census captured the time that people left for work in Tacoma. Half of all workers surveyed in the Tacoma community left for work before 8:00 a.m. Seven out of ten Tacoma resident workers left the home before 9:00 a.m. Tacoma has a substantial number of unsupervised children in the house until their school begins and after the school day ends. Latchkey programs provide supervised activities for children and youth in these situations.

The latchkey program provided prevention and intervention programming for children and youth at-risk of failing, dropping out of school, engaging in acting out behaviors, becoming involved in gangs, and experimenting with alcohol or other drugs. The latchkey program was designed to encourage pro-social behavior for coping with a broad spectrum of problems. This evaluation interprets the relationship between the program and: the development of stronger family relationships; improved school attendance, achievement, and behavior; improved self-esteem; reduced risk for substance use or actual substance use; reduced or eliminated physical, sexual, and emotional abuse; and improved feelings of community safety.

Across three of the four sites, positive impact on the students' self-esteem was the most recognizable impact. The findings indicated that students at Hunt Middle School improved in self-esteem while students at Whitman Elementary School improved in family, school, self esteem, reduced substance use, reduced personal abuse, and improved community safety. Students at McIlvaigh indicated no change in school academics and personal abuse rates. Students at Jason Lee showed improved school and self-esteem factors.

The self-esteem profile includes self-concept, and taken together, these represent an evolving, cognitive-emotional picture of each youngster. This picture is a very important developmental factor for young people and represents convictions and courage. Stanwyck (1983) proposed related categories for adolescent self-esteem: school, peer relations, emotional well-being, and physical self-perception.

Nowinski (1990) discusses the importance of the developmental process of self-esteem for youth and adolescents. The process that leads to the development of self-esteem is a dynamic one that begins in the early childhood years and is based on mastery or success in overcoming obstacles and challenges. The motivation for setting

goals and working to achieve them comes from within and is influenced by parents and adults who can provide guidance, instruction, and assistance for the obstacles and challenges.

This is the critical role that school personnel, youth specialists, and volunteers provided for the after-school latchkey programs. The latchkey program was designed to improve student self-esteem, self-image, and the ability to relate to others, emphasizing values, feelings, self-awareness, and improved decision-making skills related to drug use. Falco (1992) supports the use of prevention programs such as this after-school latchkey program for younger children, especially sixth and seventh graders, an age at which they begin experimenting with alcohol, tobacco, and other drugs. The results of this evaluation suggests that targeting younger children in the primary grades for after-school latchkey programming can have a positive impact on their self-esteem. At this earlier stage, they are still eager to learn resistance skills and are an eager audience.

Recommendations

The recommendations of this evaluation will be effective with at-risk youth only to the extent that interventions are tailored to the personal, social, cultural, and gender specific needs of the students. Latchkey after-school programs should target younger children, especially those in the primary grades and middle schools. Specific recommendations are based on the available information and multiple site observations over twelve months:

1. Review and reinforce attendance (e.g., records, procedures) of students in latchkey classes and school activities.
2. Review and assess academic achievement and school behaviors in relationship to the latchkey tutorials of individual students.
3. Provide ongoing alcohol and other drug prevention/intervention services.
4. Assess school sensitivity to multicultural factors influencing attitudes and the cultural needs of diverse populations.
5. Develop additional methods to address student and family denial of substance use issues.
6. Develop additional formative (process) and summative (outcome) measures based on program goals and objectives.
7. Provide systematic group activities to encourage and foster self-esteem and life skills.
8. Refine case management to include assessment, development of a service plan, and tracking of intervention strategies for clearer interpretation of data findings.
9. Utilize a childhood/youth risk assessment or adolescent battery to diagnose at-risk/substance use problems.
10. Review literature on latchkey/after school programs to determine the "best practices".
11. Use age-appropriate curriculum for the development of social and behavioral skills.
12. Use age-appropriate curriculum for the development of study skills and habits, and academic achievement.

References

Bill, R. E. (1989). Principals' perceptions of priorities, identification, policies, and programs for latchkey children in public schools in the State of Illinois which include grades K-8. Dissertation: Northern Illinois University.

Coleman, M., Rowland, B. & Robinson, B. (1989). Latchkey children and school-age child care: A review of programming needs. Child and Youth Care Quarterly, 18(1), 39-47.

Falco, M. (1992). The Making of a Drug-Free America. New York: Times Books.

Kraizer, S., Witte, Fryer, G. E., & Miyoshi, T. (1990). Children in self-care: A new perspective. Child Welfare, 69(6), 571-581.

Lovko, A.M. & Ullman, D. G. (1989). Research on the adjustment of latchkey children: Role of background/demographic and latchkey situation variables. Journal of Clinical Child Psychology, 18 (1), 16-24.

Nowinski, J. (1990). Substance abuse in adolescents and young adults. New York: W. W. Norton and Company.

Ross, J. G., Saavedra, P. J., Shur, G. H., Winters, F. & Felner, R. D. (1992). The effectiveness of an after-school program for primary grade latchkey students on precursors of substance abuse. Journal of Community Psychology, Special Issue, 22-38.

Seligson, M., Fersh, E., Marshal, N. L., Marx, F., & Baden, R. K. (June 1990). School-age child care: The challenge facing families. Families in Society, 71(6), 324-331.

Stanwyck, D. (1983). Self-esteem through the life span. Family and Community Health, 6,2, 11-28.

Appendix A

GROW'IN TO WIN LATCH KEY PROJECT
INTAKE FORM

CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION

REFERRAL SOURCE:

Youth Intervention Counselor _____

Referring Person _____ Date of Intake _____

Student Name _____ B.D. _____ I.D. _____

Address _____ Zip Code _____

School _____ Grade _____ Sex _____Male _____Female

Parent / Guardian _____ Telephone _____

Source of Referral: ___ Self ___ Peer ___ Parent ___ Staff ___ Agency ____ Other

Indicators or Reason for Referral: ___ Attendance ___ Academic ___ School Behavior

(Check all that apply) ___ Peer Problem ___ Home Problem ___ Other (Specify)

___ Witnessed Substance Use ___ Symptoms of Substance Use

Free/Reduced Lunch ___ yes ___ no

Race: ___ American Indian ___ Asian ___ Black ___ Hispanic ___ White ___ Pacific Islander

Special Program: ___ Regular Ed. ___ Special Ed. ___ Gifted ___ Chapter 1 ___ Other (Specify)

Living Situation: ___ Both Parents ___ Single Parent ___ Guardian ___ Shared ___ Alone

___ Sibling ___ Other (Specify)

Leave Date: ____/____/____ Reason: ___ Graduated ___ Transferred ___ Withdrew ___ Other

Status: _____ Active _____ Inactive

NOTES:

SERVICES TO DATE:

Date Initiated	Service	Status	Comment
____/____/____	_____	_____	_____
____/____/____	_____	_____	_____
____/____/____	_____	_____	_____
____/____/____	_____	_____	_____

Appendix B
PRE/POST TEST FORM

GROW'IN TO WIN LATCH KEY PROJECT
FOR PROJECT PARTICIPANTS

Date: _____ Counselor Assigned: _____

Student Name: _____ I. D. Number: _____

Respondent: _____ Student _____ Parent _____ School Staff

FAMILY

Relationship with Parents

0) Fine / No Problem
1) Some Conflict (normal range)
2) Frequent Conflict
3) Constant Conflict

Relationship with Siblings

0) Fine / No Problem (no Sibs)
1) Some Conflict (normal range)
2) Frequent Conflict
3) Constant Conflict

Living Situation

0) Always lived with parent (s)
1) Lives with a relative
2) Lives with a family friend
3) Living in unsupervised arrangement

Familial Expectations

0) Fulfills family expectations
1) Fulfills most expectations
2) Fulfills some expectations
3) Never meets expectations

FAMILY SCORE _____

SCHOOL

Academics

0) Passing all subjects
1) Passing 5 or more
2) Passing 3 to 4
3) Passing 2 or less

School Attendance (last month)

0) No absences
1) Missed 2 or less days
2) Missed 3 to 5 days
3) Missed 6 or more days

Tardiness to Class (last month)

0) Never Tardy
1) 2 or less
2) 3 to 5 tardies
3) 6 or more tardies

School Incidents (last 60 days)

0) No problems
1) 1 to 2 disruptive / aggressive incidents
2) Frequently displays disruptive/aggressive behaviors
3) Dropped from classes or suspended from school

SCHOOL SCORE _____

SELF ESTEEM

Peer Relationships

0) No difficulty making friends
1) Has some difficulty
2) Frequently has difficulty
3) Has no friends

Feelings About Self

0) Strong sense of personal worth
1) Generally feels O.K. about self
2) Rarely feels good about self
3) Strongly dislikes self

Depression

0) Occasionally feels "blue" (within normal limits)
1) Periodic depression
2) Frequently feels depressed
3) Depressed with thoughts of hurting have self or others

Anger

0) Manages feelings of anger effectively
1) Occasionally acts inappropriate when angry
2) Frequent acting out when angry, with acts of aggression
3) Frequently acts out with aggression, police have been involved

Activities and Interests

0) Involved in many activities and personal interests
1) Has some involvement in community based activities
2) Rarely participates in community based activities
3) Never willing to be involved

Peer Affiliation

0) Identifies with socially/legally acceptable group
1) Fringe involvement with socially and legally accepted group
2) Fringe involvement with socially and legally unaccepted group
3) Identifies and participates with socially and legally unaccepted group

SELF ESTEEM SCORE _____

SUBSTANCE USE

Peer Use (drugs and alcohol)

0) Friends are drug free
1) Friends have used 1 to 2 times
2) Friends used occasionally
3) Friends use regularly

If friends use, what do they use?

_____

_____

SUBSTANCE USE

Family Use

0) Family uses no illegal drugs or uses alcohol appropriately
1) Family uses no illegal drugs with periodic alcohol abuse
2) Family is impacted by chemical dependency, received treatment
3) Family is impacted by chemical dependency with no treatment

If family uses, what do they use?

_____

_____

Personal Use

0) I am are drug free
1) I have used 1 to 2 times
2) I use occasionally
3) I use regularly

If you use, what do you use?

_____

_____

SUBSTANCE USE SCORE _____

ABUSE (Physical, Sexual, Emotional)

Personal

0) I have never been abused
1) I have been abused and have received help
2) I have been abused and never received help
3) I am currently being abused

If you have been abused, please explain what type of abuse?

_____

_____

PERSONAL ABUSE SCORE _____

COMMUNITY

Your Neighborhood

0) I always feel safe
1) I usually feel safe
2) I rarely feel safe
3) I never feel safe

What makes you feel unsafe?

_____

_____

COMMUNITY SAFETY SCORE _____

Appendix C

C-STARS EVALUATION FORM

AFTER SCHOOL PROGRAM: District _____ School _____ Date _____ WHJ

ACADEMIC/EDUCATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

What Services are being provided?

____ Drug Prevention activities (please specify) _____
____ Drug Intervention activities _____
____ Case management _____
____ Individual counseling _____
____ Referrals _____

SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT

____ Support groups _____
____ Peer group support _____
____ Other (please specify) _____

RECREATIONAL ACTIVITIES

____ Kinds of Activities (please specify) _____ _____
_____
_____
_____

OTHER

____ Food _____
____ Clothing _____
____ Transportation _____
____ Supplies/Materials _____
____ Other needs (please specify) _____

PROGRAM INFORMATION

Youth Intervention Counselor (Name) _____
Recreational Specialist (Name) _____
Other (please specify) _____

How Are Services Being Provided?

____ Referrals to Youth Intervention Counselor _____
____ Referrals to CORE Team _____
____ Informal Assessments _____
____ Formal Assessments _____
____ Program of Services Prescribed _____ _____
_____
____ Chemically dependent students referred to professional treatment _____
____ Aftercare support provided at the school for students _____

Site Specific Variations:

___Disciplinary referrals and consequences_____
___Staffing variations in the Youth Intervention Counselor position_____
_____

___The extent to which an informed, trusting relationship exists between the YIC and school staff _____
_____

___ The extent to which consultations with school staff about student-related issues occur_____
_____

Who is Served?

___Number of students who have received individualized, direct services_____
___Number of female students
___Number of male students
___Number of Ethnic groups: Asian__Black__Indian__Latino__White__Other__

How Effective are the Services?

STUDENTS
___School Attendance_____
___School Performance_____
___Increased Communication with family/friends_____
___Greater Acceptance of Self_____
___Stronger Commitment to School_____
___Increased Optimism_____
___Reduction in School Vandalism_____
___Reduction in Disciplinary Referrals_____
___Reduction in Unhealthy Behaviors (disruptive or highly inappropriate behaviors at elementary level and AOD use at middle school level_____

SCHOOL STAFF
___Improved set of Referral Skills among school staff_____
___A greater acceptance of the value and need for after school services for students_____
___Other (please specify)_____

How Much Do These Services Cost?

$___Per Student (approximately)_____

Some Barriers to Program Effectiveness

___Low Degree of Implementation (planned program components are simply not taking place yet for a variety of reasons_____

___Time and Resource Constraints(the Youth Intervention Counselor serves several sites and has a difficult time attaining a "critical mass" of effort at any one school_____

___Lack of District/School/Agency Support (program staff and services are not well integrated into the ongoing school operation)_____

____Denial and lack of Awareness (among school staff, parents, students, community members making it difficult for the program to operate_____

____Communication and Coordination (there is a need to improve communication at several levels: among school staff and program staff, program staff and community agencies, program staff and students.
_____

____ Unclear Confidentiality Requirements (in this sensitive area many agencies have strict legal confidentiality requirements. Others have vague or illusory requirements. These need to be clear so that the necessary communications and coordination takes place_____
_____

How Can the Program be Strengthened and Improved?

____Does the program have an underlying theoretical framework that guides development and improvement (e.g., it is not sufficient to simple put all required components in place).
_____
_____

____Youth Intervention Counselor must be assigned to school for periods of time which will allow the Counselor to make a difference_____

____Increase In service Training and Technical Assistance to Teachers and Administrators so that they can better understand and carry out their roles in the program._____

____Greater emphasis on the prevention and early intervention intents of the programs, rather than a "crisis orientation"._____

____Support and Continuity and Professional Development of the Youth Intervention Counselor (builds trust and rapport necessary for the services to reach the students._____
_____

____Integrate the program into the regular, ongoing operation of the school (unless the Youth Intervention Counselor is viewed as part of the school, the services will be viewed with uncertainty, instability, and lack of commitment._____
_____

____Get Serious About Outcome Evaluation (It is in everyone's best interests to conceptualize and plan a meaningful evaluation of the program at federal, state, and local levels)_____
_____

What Are the Key Elements of a Successful Program?

____Stability of the Program and Staff
____Trust in the Skills/Integrity of the Youth Intervention Counselor
____Clear and Realistic Expectations of the Program
____Administrative Support
____Involvement of School/Community/Agency in the Program
____Motivation and Accountability among the Students Served
____Parents/Other Support for Students in the Program

RECOMMENDATION: _____

_____

_____

_____

RECOMMENDATION: _____

_____

_____

_____

RECOMMENDATION: _____

_____

_____

_____

RECOMMENDATION: _____

_____

_____

_____

RECOMMENDATION: _____

_____

_____

_____

RECOMMENDATION: _____

_____

_____

_____